



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES

SIMON, CEPHAS, PETER

It is generally held that these three names apply to one person, who was the chief of the Twelve Apostles and the first witness to the Resurrection. It is, of course, recognized that there was another apostle named Simon, but he plays only a small part in Christian tradition.

The object of this note is to collect and discuss the evidence that suggests the existence of another tradition which separated Peter from Cephas, and — though the evidence for this point is less good — possibly did not regard Peter but some other Simon as the first witness to the risen Lord. It is not intended to increase knowledge but rather to suggest doubt.

According to all the traditions, beginning with that of Mark, Simon was the name of a fisherman on the Sea of Galilee who followed Jesus. He is called by that name in Mark 1, 16 and in Mark 1, 29 f. But according to Mark 3, 16 when Jesus appointed the Twelve he gave Simon the name of Peter. The text (*καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον, καὶ Τάκωβον κ. τ. λ.*) is remarkably clumsy, and if there were any evidence one might suspect that the words *καὶ . . . Σίμωνι* were an interpolation. But Matthew has straightened out the Greek, and speaks of *Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος* (10, 2), and Luke also straightens out the construction with the same statement that Simon was called Peter. Thus there is no reason to doubt the universal tradition that there were two Simons among the list of the disciples and that one of them was called Peter; but was either of these Simons the first witness of the risen Lord? According to Luke 24, 34 the first person to see the risen Lord was Simon, but it is not clear whether this means Simon Peter or some other Simon. The point is one of considerable textual difficulty; in most of the manuscripts we read that the two disciples who had gone to Emmaus had returned to Jerusalem where they found *τοὺς ἔνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς λέγοντας ὅτι ὅντως ἤγειρθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὥφθη Σίμωνι*. If that text is right, Luke is referring in this incredibly casual manner to the first appearance of Jesus, of which he gives absolutely no description. There is therefore not a little to be said in favor of the other reading of *λέγοντες* for *λέγοντας*, found in Codex Bezae and implied by Origen, which must mean that Simon was one of the two who went to Emmaus and

saw Jesus on the road. But in this case Simon cannot be Simon Peter, for the text states that the two who returned to Jerusalem found the eleven, which must include Peter, gathered together in that city. It would be foolish to suggest that this view ought to be adopted, but it suffices to show that the question of the identification of Simon with Peter is not quite so clear as it seems at first.

The question of Cephas is even more difficult, as will be seen if the evidence be taken in approximately chronological order. The apostle Peter is only mentioned once in the Pauline Epistles; Cephas is mentioned eight times. Does Paul mean that they are the same person? In the Epistle to the Galatians¹ he writes . . . ἰδόντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυντίας καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς, ὁ γάρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρω εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ Θύνη, καὶ γνώντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ . . . κ. τ. λ. Is it Paul's intention to identify Peter and Cephas? To call the same man by two names in the same sentence is, to say the least, a curious device, and Clement of Alexandria is quoted by Eusebius² as believing that Cephas is intended to be different from Peter; he suggests that he was one of the Seventy. The *Epistola Apostolorum* and the Egyptian KO go further and produce a list of the Twelve containing the names of both Peter and Cephas.

A similar conclusion might well be reached by a consideration of Corinthians 15, 5, where in recording the appearance of the risen Lord Paul says . . . ὥφθη Κηφᾶ, εἴτα τούς δώδεκα . . . κ. τ. λ. It is, of course, possible that Cephas is included in the Twelve, but if one had no other information, it would probably be natural to conclude that he was not, in which case he was certainly not identical with Peter.

Why then has Christian tradition so completely lost sight of these doubts, which were clearly present in various forms to Clement of Alexandria and to the still earlier writer of the *Epistola Apostolorum*? The answer is that the Fourth Gospel definitely states in John 1, 48 that Cephas is Peter — σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ νιὸς Ἰωάννου, σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς ὁ ἐρμηνεύεται Πέτρος. So long as it was believed that the Fourth Gospel was written by one of the Twelve, a contemporary of Peter

¹ Galatians 2, 7 ff.

² Eus. Eccl. Hist. i. 12, 2. ἡ δ' ἱστορία παρὰ Κλήμεντι κατὰ τὴν πέμπτην τῶν Ἱεροτάσσεων, ἐν ᾧ καὶ Κηφᾶν, περὶ οὐ φῆσιν ὁ Παῦλος, δε τὸ δὲ ἥλθεν Κηφᾶς |εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ἵνα φῆσι γεγονέναι τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα μαθητῶν, ὁμώνυμον Πέτρῳ τυγχάνοντα τῷ ἀποστόλῳ.

and a disciple of Jesus, it was reasonable to accept this as final.¹ But for those who take a very different view of the Fourth Gospel it is not unreasonable to ask why they ought not to share the doubts of Clement and the Epistola. The answer is that we are influenced, and probably ought to be influenced, by a combination of the fact that the Gospel of Mark when it breaks off seems to be leading up to an appearance of Jesus to Peter, and that Paul says that the first appearance of Jesus was to Cephas; ergo, Peter is Cephas. This is no doubt a reasonable proposition, but it is just as well to understand that it does not rest on the strongest possible authority, for Paul nowhere says that Peter is Cephas, though commentators have the bad habit² (to which I plead guilty myself) of constantly talking of Peter when he says Cephas, and Mark never speaks of Cephas at all.

K. LAKE.

FOURTEEN GENERATIONS: 490 YEARS

AN EXPLANATION OF THE GENEALOGY OF JESUS

"So the whole number of generations from Abraham to David is fourteen generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon fourteen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Messiah fourteen generations." Matt. 1, 17.

The difficulties presented by the genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke, whether examined separately or compared with each other, were early remarked, and the discussion of them is a voluminous chapter in Christian literature.³ The question why the generations are divided into three periods was raised by Chrysostom in a sermon on Matt. 1, 17 (*In Matt. Hom. iv*). The Jews, he says, had in these periods successively three different forms of government, aristocracy,

¹ It is an interesting speculation to ask why Clement did not hold this view. The answer is partly that he wished to save Peter's reputation at the expense of Cephas, who was only one of the Seventy, partly perhaps that he knew Greek a little better than most men and felt better the implication of Paul's words. But I wish we knew more about the text of the Fourth Gospel used by Clement.

² A consideration of the textual phenomena in the Epistle to the Galatians shows that this bad habit is not confined to modern commentators.

³ Friederich Spanheim (1600–1649), in his *Dubia Evangelica* (1639), deals with no less than twenty-six such problems in Matt. 1, 1–17, at a length of 215 solid and solidly learned pages.